

## ON LOCALLY FINITE COVERINGS

BY

T. PRZYMUSIŃSKI (WARSZAWA)\*

**1. Introduction.** It is well known that the notions of a locally finite open covering and of a  $\sigma$ -discrete open covering are tightly related. For example, the statements that every open covering of a regular space admits a locally finite (respectively,  $\sigma$ -discrete) open refinement are equivalent and both characterize paracompact spaces. Let us consider the following two properties of topological spaces:

(A) Every  $\sigma$ -discrete open covering admits a locally finite open refinement.

(B) Every locally finite open covering admits a  $\sigma$ -discrete open refinement.

One easily observes that property (A) is in fact equivalent to countable paracompactness. Therefore — in virtue of Rudin's example [6] of a normal non-countably paracompact space — there exist normal spaces that do not satisfy (A).

On the other hand, it is known that each normal space satisfies (B) (see [2], Exercise 5.1.I). G. M. Reed asks if every regular space satisfies (B). The following example gives a negative answer to his question.

**Example 1.** A metacompact Moore <sup>(1)</sup> space  $X$  and its locally finite open covering  $\mathcal{V}$  with no  $\sigma$ -discrete open refinement.

The covering  $\mathcal{V}$  has cardinality  $\omega_1$  (the smallest possible) and is locally of order not greater than 3. Example 1 is constructed in Section 2.

In 1958 Katětov [4] raised the following still open problem:

**PROBLEM (Katětov).** Can each locally finite open covering of a closed subspace  $F$  of a collectionwise normal space  $X$  be extended to a locally finite open covering of  $X$ ? (See the note Added in Proof.)

\* This paper was completed while the author was visiting the University of Pittsburgh as a Mellon Postdoctoral Fellow.

<sup>(1)</sup> A regular space  $X$  is a *Moore space* if there exists a family  $\{\mathcal{A}_n\}_{n \in \omega}$  of open coverings of  $X$  such that for each point  $x \in X$  and its neighborhood  $U$  there exists an  $n \in \omega$  with  $x \in \text{St}(x, \mathcal{A}_n) = \bigcup \{A \in \mathcal{A}_n : x \in A\} \subset U$ .

Katětov obtained the following partial results:

**Definition.** A covering  $\mathcal{A}$  is *uniformly locally finite* if there exists a locally finite open covering  $\mathcal{B}$  such that each  $B \in \mathcal{B}$  intersects only finitely many elements of  $\mathcal{A}$ .

**FACT 1.** *Every uniformly locally finite open covering of a closed subspace  $F$  of a collectionwise normal space can be extended to a uniformly locally finite open covering of  $X$ .*

**FACT 2.** *Every locally finite covering of a collectionwise normal countably paracompact space is uniformly locally finite.*

In connection with these results a natural question arises: Is every locally finite open covering of a collectionwise normal space uniformly locally finite? The following example answers this question in the negative.

**Example 2.** A collectionwise normal space  $Y$  and its (countable, cozero) locally finite open cover which is not uniformly locally finite.

In [5] the notion of a weak cb-space was defined. A normal space is a *weak cb-space* if every countable covering consisting of regularly open <sup>(2)</sup> sets admits a locally finite open refinement.

Therefore, when restricted to the class of normal spaces, this notion is a weak form of countable paracompactness. Mack and Johnson [5] ask (see also [1], p. 249) if there exists a normal space which is not a weak cb-space. It turns out that Example 2 provides a negative answer. (The last question has been answered independently by Hardy and Juhász [3].)

Example 2 is constructed in Section 3.

**2. Construction of Example 1.** The following, supposedly known, lemma has been communicated to the author by Eric K. van Douwen.

**LEMMA.** *There exists a family  $\{A_\alpha\}_{\alpha < 2^{\omega_0}}$  of disjoint subsets of the real line  $\mathbf{R}$  such that for each  $\alpha < 2^{\omega_0}$  and a non-empty open subset  $U$  of  $\mathbf{R}$  the set  $A_\alpha \cap U$  is of second category in  $\mathbf{R}$ , i.e.  $A_\alpha \cap U$  is not the union of a countable sequence of nowhere dense subsets of  $\mathbf{R}$ .*

**Proof.** Let us enumerate by  $\{D_\beta\}_{\beta < 2^{\omega_0}}$  all uncountable  $G_\delta$ -subsets of  $\mathbf{R}$  in such a way that each uncountable  $G_\delta$ -subset appears in that sequence continuum many times. Let us also recall that every uncountable  $G_\delta$ -subset of  $\mathbf{R}$  has cardinality continuum (see [2], Exercise 4.5.5). For each  $\alpha, \beta < 2^{\omega_0}$  with  $\alpha \leq \beta$  choose a point  $x_{\beta, \alpha}$  in such a way that

$$x_{\beta, \alpha} \in D_\beta \setminus \{x_{\gamma, \delta} : \gamma < \beta \text{ or } \gamma = \beta \text{ and } \delta < \alpha\}.$$

<sup>(2)</sup> A subset  $U$  of  $X$  is *regularly open* if  $U = \text{Int } \overline{U}$ .

Put  $A_\alpha = \{x_{\beta,\alpha} : \alpha \leq \beta\}$  and observe that the sets  $A_\alpha$  are disjoint and for each  $\beta < 2^{\omega_0}$  we have  $|A_\alpha \cap D_\beta| = 2^{\omega_0}$ . Let  $U$  be an arbitrary non-empty open subset of  $\mathbf{R}$ . If  $A_\alpha \cap U$  were of first category in  $\mathbf{R}$ , then there would exist a sequence  $\{F_n\}_{n \in \omega}$  of closed and nowhere dense subsets of  $\mathbf{R}$  such that

$$A_\alpha \cap U \subset \bigcup_{n \in \omega} F_n.$$

This is however impossible, since  $U \setminus \bigcup_{n \in \omega} F_n$  is an uncountable  $\mathcal{G}_\delta$ -subset of  $\mathbf{R}$  and, therefore,

$$A_\alpha \cap (U \setminus \bigcup_{n \in \omega} F_n) \neq \emptyset.$$

We shall define a new topology on the plane  $\mathbf{R}^2$ . Let  $\{A_\alpha\}_{\alpha < 2^{\omega_0}}$  be a family of subsets of  $\mathbf{R}$  satisfying conditions of Lemma 1 and let  $\{B_n\}_{n < \omega}$  be a countable base for the real line consisting of non-empty sets. Since for each  $n < \omega$  the set  $A_n \cap B_n$  is uncountable, we can choose a family  $\{x_{\alpha,\beta}^n\}_{\alpha < \beta < \omega_1}$  of its distinct points.

In the new topology on  $\mathbf{R}^2$ , all points  $(x, y) \in \mathbf{R}^2$  such that  $y \neq 0$  will be isolated and the base  $\{U_m(x)\}_{m < \omega}$  of neighborhoods of the point  $(x, 0)$  will be defined in the following way:

1° if there exist  $n \in \omega$  and  $\alpha < \beta < \omega_1$  such that  $x = x_{\alpha,\beta}^n$ , then

$$U_m(x) = \left\{ (t, v) \in \mathbf{R}^2 : t = v + x, t \in A_\alpha \cup A_\beta \cup \{x\} \text{ and } 0 \leq v < \frac{1}{m+1} \right\};$$

2° otherwise,

$$U_m(x) = \left\{ (x, v) \in \mathbf{R}^2 : 0 \leq v < \frac{1}{m+1} \right\}.$$

Denote by  $X$  the set  $\mathbf{R}^2$  with the above-defined topology. One easily checks that  $X$  is a completely regular, metacompact Moore space.

For each  $\alpha$  such that  $\omega \leq \alpha \leq \omega_1$  define open subsets  $V_\alpha$  of  $X$  by putting

$$V_\alpha = \{(x, y) \in \mathbf{R}^2 : x \in A_\alpha\} \quad \text{if } \omega \leq \alpha < \omega_1$$

and

$$V_{\omega_1} = X \setminus \{(x, 0) \in \mathbf{R}^2 : x \in A_\alpha \text{ and } \omega \leq \alpha < \omega_1\}.$$

Clearly, the family  $\mathcal{V} = \{V_\alpha\}_{\omega \leq \alpha \leq \omega_1}$  forms an open covering of the space  $X$  and each point of the space  $X$  has a neighborhood intersecting at most three elements of the family  $\mathcal{V}$ . Therefore,  $\mathcal{V}$  is locally finite. We shall show that  $\mathcal{V}$  does not have a  $\sigma$ -discrete open refinement.

For assume otherwise and let

$$\mathcal{G} = \bigcup_{k < \omega} \mathcal{G}_k$$

be an open refinement of  $\mathcal{V}$  such that the family  $\mathcal{G}_k$  is discrete for each  $k < \omega$ . For every  $k, m < \omega$  and  $\omega \leq a < \omega_1$  write

$$A_{a,k,m} = \{x \in A_a : \text{there exists a } G \in \mathcal{G}_k \text{ such that } U_m(x) \subset G \subset V_a\}.$$

Clearly, for each  $a$  such that  $\omega \leq a < \omega_1$  we have

$$A_a = \bigcup_{k,m < \omega} A_{a,k,m}.$$

Therefore, since  $A_a$ 's are not of first category in  $\mathbf{R}$ , for each  $\omega \leq a < \omega_1$  there exist  $k(a), m(a)$  and  $n(a)$  belonging to  $\omega$  such that

$$B_{n(a)} \subset \bar{A}_{a,k(a),m(a)}^{\mathbf{R}}.$$

Choose two distinct ordinal numbers  $\alpha$  and  $\beta$  such that  $\omega \leq \alpha < \beta < \omega_1$ , and  $k(\alpha) = k(\beta) = k$ ,  $m(\alpha) = m(\beta) = m$  and  $n(\alpha) = n(\beta) = n$ . We shall show that each neighborhood of the point  $z = (x, 0)$ , where  $x = x_{\alpha,\beta}^n$ , intersects at least two elements of  $\mathcal{G}_k$ , which will contradict the discreteness of the family  $\mathcal{G}_k$ . Let us choose an arbitrary  $l < \omega$  and consider the neighborhood  $U_l(x)$  of the point  $z$ .

Since  $x \in \bar{A}_{\alpha,k,m}^{\mathbf{R}} \cap \bar{A}_{\beta,k,m}^{\mathbf{R}}$ , there exist  $t_1 \in A_{\alpha,k,m}$  and  $t_2 \in A_{\beta,k,m}$  such that

$$|t_1 - x| + |t_2 - x| < \frac{1}{l + m + 2}.$$

By the definition of  $U_l(x)$ , we have

$$U_l(x) \cap U_m(t_1) \neq \emptyset \neq U_l(x) \cap U_m(t_2)$$

and there exist  $G_1, G_2 \in \mathcal{G}_k$  such that

$$U_m(t_1) \subset G_1 \subset V_\alpha \quad \text{and} \quad U_m(t_2) \subset G_2 \subset V_\beta.$$

The sets  $G_1$  and  $G_2$  are different since  $V_\alpha \cap V_\beta = \emptyset$ , and we have

$$U_l(x) \cap G_1 \neq \emptyset \neq U_l(x) \cap G_2.$$

Therefore, we showed that an arbitrary neighborhood of  $z$  intersects two different elements of  $\mathcal{G}_k$ , which is a contradiction and completes the proof of the properties of the space  $X$ .

**Remark.** If in our construction we used rather all sets  $A_\alpha$ ,  $\alpha < 2^{\omega_0}$ , instead of using only  $\omega_1$  of them, we would obtain an open locally finite covering of  $X$  of cardinality  $2^{\omega_0}$  having no open refinement consisting of less than  $2^{\omega_0}$  discrete families.

**3. Construction of Example 2.** Let  $X$  be an arbitrary example of a collectionwise normal space which is not countably paracompact, e.g. Rudin's example [6]. Hence there must exist an increasing sequence  $\{U_n\}_{n < \omega}$  of open subsets of  $X$ , covering  $X$  and having no locally finite

open refinement (see [2], Theorem 5.2.1). Let  $Z^* = X \times \omega$  be the Cartesian product of  $X$  and of the space  $\omega$  of natural numbers with the product topology, and let

$$Z = \bigcup_{n < \omega} (\bar{U}_n \times \{n\})$$

be the subspace of  $Z^*$ . Since  $Z$  is a closed subset of a collectionwise normal space  $Z^*$ , it is also collectionwise normal. Clearly, the increasing open covering  $\{V_n\}_{n < \omega}$  of  $Z^*$ , where  $V_n = Z \cap (U_n \times \{0, 1, 2, \dots, n\})$ , also does not have a locally finite open refinement. Moreover, since

$$Z \setminus \bar{V}_n = \bigcup_{k > n} (\bar{U}_k \times \{k\}),$$

the sets  $Z \setminus \bar{V}_n$  are open  $F_\sigma$ -subsets of  $Z$ .

Let us define a modified topology on the set  $Y = Z \times [0, 1]$ . All points  $(z, t) \in Y$  with  $t > 0$  are isolated, and points of the form  $(z, 0)$  have the same base of neighborhoods as in the product topology of  $Z$  and  $[0, 1]$ . One easily checks that the space  $Y$  (considered with the new topology) is collectionwise normal.

Let us consider an increasing countable open cover  $\mathcal{G} = \{G_n\}_{n < \omega}$  of  $Y$ , where  $G_n = V_n \times [0, 1]$ .

Obviously,  $\mathcal{G}$  does not have a locally finite open refinement in  $Y$ . Moreover, the sets  $G_n$  are regularly open in  $Y$ . Indeed,

$$\bar{G}_n^Y = (\bar{V}_n^Z \times \{0\}) \cup G_n$$

and, therefore,  $\text{Int} \bar{G}_n^Y = G_n$ . This shows that  $Y$  is an example of a collectionwise normal space, which is not a weak cb-space.

Let us put  $W_n = Y \setminus \bar{G}_n$ . The sets

$$W_n = ((Z \setminus \bar{V}_n) \times \{0\}) \cup (Z \setminus V_n) \times [0, 1]$$

are open  $F_\sigma$ -subsets of  $Y$ , and since  $Y$  is normal, they are cozero sets. Let us consider a countable cozero covering  $\mathcal{W} = \{W_n\}_{n < \omega} \cup \{Y\}$  of  $Y$ . Clearly,  $\mathcal{W}$  is locally finite, since  $\mathcal{G}$  is an increasing covering of  $Y$ . It suffices to show that  $\mathcal{W}$  is not a uniformly locally finite covering of  $Y$ . Assume that there exists a locally finite open covering  $\mathcal{B}$  of  $Y$  such that each  $B \in \mathcal{B}$  intersects only finitely many elements of  $\mathcal{W}$  and for each  $B \in \mathcal{B}$  find an  $n(B) \in \omega$  such that  $B \cap W_{n(B)} = \emptyset$ .

Write  $B_n = \{B \in \mathcal{B} : n(B) = n\}$  and observe that  $\{B_n\}_{n < \omega}$  is a locally finite open covering of  $Y$  and that  $B_n \cap W_n = \emptyset$ . Therefore,

$$B_n \subset \text{Int}(Y \setminus W_n) = \text{Int} \bar{G}_n = G_n,$$

which is a contradiction, since  $\mathcal{G}$  does not admit a locally finite open refinement.

Added in proof. The problem of Katětov, mentioned in the introduction, has been solved in the negative (see T. Przymusiński and M. Wage, *Collectionwise normality and extensions of locally finite coverings*, to appear in *Fundamenta Mathematicae*).

#### REFERENCES

- [1] R. A. Aldò and H. L. Shapiro, *Normal topological spaces*, Cambridge 1974.
- [2] R. Engelking, *General topology*, Warszawa 1977.
- [3] K. Hardy and I. Juhász, *Normality and the weak cb property*, Notices of the American Mathematical Society 1 (1976), Abstract # 731-54-57.
- [4] М. Катетов, *О продолжении локально конечных покрытий*, Colloquium Mathematicum 6 (1958), p. 145-151.
- [5] J. E. Mack and D. G. Johnson, *The Dedekind completion of  $\mathcal{O}(X)$* , Pacific Journal of Mathematics 20 (1967), p. 231-243.
- [6] M. E. Rudin, *A normal space  $X$  for which  $X \times I$  is not normal*, Fundamenta Mathematicae 73 (1971), p. 179-186.

UNIVERSITY OF PITTSBURGH, PITTSBURGH, PA  
INSTITUTE OF MATHEMATICS  
POLISH ACADEMY OF SCIENCES, WARSZAWA

*Reçu par la Rédaction le 15. 3. 1976*

---